

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

09/470,859 12/23/99 SARGENT

R A-68342-1/RM

EXAMINER

HM12/1025

FLEHR HOHBACH TEST ALBRITTON
& HERBERT LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER SUITE 3400
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4187

WOITACH, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1632

DATE MAILED:

10/25/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

| | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/470,859 | Applicant(s) SARGENT ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Joseph Weitach | Art Unit 1632 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 and 39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 39 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Application/Control Number: 09/470,859

Page 2

Art Unit: 1632

DETAILED ACTION

Please note that the Examiner of record and art unit has changed. The Examiner of record is now **Joseph Woitach** and the group art unit is now **1632**.

This application is an original application filed December 23, 1999, which claims benefit to provisional application 60/153,795, filed September 14, 1999.

Applicants' amendment filed August 13, 2001, paper number 10, has been received and entered. Claims 38 and 40 have been canceled. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-37 and 39 are pending, and claim 39 has been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected invention, made without traverse in Paper No. 7. Claims 1-37 are currently under examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for the claims of record. The specification does not

Art Unit: 1632

enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Applicants summarize independent claims 1 and 22 and note that the instant claims encompass only methods for producing a recombinant zygote or animal possessing the targeted DNA sequence modification (Applicants' amendment, bottom of page 4). It is argued that Campbell *et al.* and Cibelli *et al.* each teach and demonstrate that the methodology of nuclear transfer is enabled, and that US Patent 5,763,240 and copending application 09/079,877 (note-now abandoned) each teach and fully enable a method of targeting and altering a pre-selected nuclear DNA sequence and producing a live mammalian offspring by transferring the nuclei from a cell line to an enucleated oocyte. Applicants point out that the instant invention is directed to a method and does not require a resulting phenotype, and argue that in view of the enabling art of record, the claimed methods are fully enabled. See Applicants' amendment, pages 2-4. Applicants arguments have been fully considered, but not found persuasive.

First, Examiner agrees that the methods taught in Campbell *et al.* and Cibelli *et al.* demonstrate that the methodology of nuclear transfer was enabled at the time of filing, and that US Patent 5,763,240 teach a method of targeting and altering a pre-selected nuclear DNA sequence. However, the instantly claimed methods do not recite the specific enabled method steps taught in these references. Presently, claims 1 and 22 recite only a method step wherein the targeted polynucleotide is introduced into a cell/nucleus, and there is no step wherein the nucleus with the targeted DNA is selected or a limitation requiring that the resulting nucleus

Art Unit: 1632

contains any selected or targeted polynucleotide sequences. As pending, the instant claims encompass a cell/nucleus containing the preselected DNA inserted into any portion of the genome. Further, the methods of nuclear transfer require more than simply transplanting a nucleus into an oocyte. As set forth in the previous office action methods to produce a recombinant zygote require method steps wherein the cell/nucleus containing the targeted complementary DNA is selected, enucleation of the oocyte, and activation of the nuclear transferred chimeric oocyte to form a zygote (see page 2, basis of 112, first paragraph rejection). Further, as set forth in the disclosure of application 09/079,877, the methods of producing a recombinant nucleus and resulting transgenic zygote/animal require RecA coated targeted DNA. The working examples in the instant specification also demonstrate that only RecA is capable of generating the recombinant/targeted nuclei. There is no evidence of record that any other recombinase besides RecA would be functional or that endogenous recombinases would be functional. To the contrary, as pointed out in Applicants arguments, the introduction of only single-stranded polynucleotides results in 0% recombination (page 4), suggesting the endogenous recombinases are incapable of incorporating the targeted polynucleotide.

The instant specification teaches that the introduction of a targeted polynucleotide coated with RecA can undergo homologous recombination and alter the genome of the cell/nucleus (see for example working Example 2). Further, Examiner would agree that the specific methods taught by Campbell *et al.*, Cibelli *et al.* and US Patent 5,763,240 provide specific guidance to perform nuclear transfer and provide methods for targeted homologous recombination.

Art Unit: 1632

However, the instant claims encompass an invention which is much broader than the teachings disclosed in these references, or which is enabled by the instant specification. The specification fails to provide a clear nexus between the specific the working embodiments taught in the instant specification and the art of record, and the large breadth presently encompassed by the claims of record.

Thus, in view of the lack of guidance, working examples, breadth of the claims, the level of skill in the art and state of the art at the time of the claimed invention was made, it would have required undue experimentation to make and/or use the invention as claimed. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1632

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell *et al.* or Cibelli *et al.* and Zarling *et al.* (US Patent 5,763,240).

Applicants summarize claim 1 and the basis of Examiner's rejection. Applicants agree that the teachings of Campbell *et al.* or Cibelli *et al.* and Zarling *et al.* provide the necessary teachings for nuclear transfer and targeted homologous recombination, however neither references provides the necessary motivation to combine the references to produce the claimed invention. See Applicants' amendment, page 6. Applicants arguments have been fully considered, but not found persuasive.

Examiner agrees that Zarling *et al.* does not specifically state to produce a recombinant zygote, however the specification clearly teaches that the methodology can be used to target DNA sequences 'typically by knocking out at least one allele of a gene (i.e. making a mutant, nonfunctional allele)' (column 6; lines 39-45) and the references cited in the specification clearly teach recombination for the production of transgenic animals (column 3, Capecchi; column 4, Mansour *et al.*, Valancius and Smithies, and references in lines 36-45). In addition, both Campbell *et al.* or Cibelli *et al.* teach that nuclear transfer can be used for cloning, however each teaches that the methodology can be adapted for enormous benefits in research and agriculture for the 'modification by gene targeting' (Campbell *et al.* page 66, last paragraph in first column). Clearly, each reference provides the motivation to combine and use described methods to generate a zygote/ animal in which the genome has been altered through homologous recombination.

Art Unit: 1632

Therefore, for the reasons above and of record, the rejection is maintained.

Claims 22-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura *et al.* and Zarling *et al.* (US Patent 5,763,240).

Applicants summarize claim 22 and the basis of Examiner's rejection. Applicants agree that the teachings of Kimura *et al.* and Zarling *et al.* provide the necessary teachings for nuclear transfer and targeted homologous recombination, however neither reference provides the necessary motivation to combine the references to produce the claimed invention. See Applicants' amendment, pages 7-8. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered, but not found persuasive.

As noted above, Examiner agrees that Zarling *et al.* does not specifically state to produce a recombinant zygote, however the specification clearly teaches that the methodology can be used to target DNA sequences 'typically by knocking out at least one allele of a gene (i.e. making a mutant, nonfunctional allele)' (column 6; lines 39-45) and the references cited in the specification clearly teach recombination for the production of transgenic animals (column 3, Capecchi; column 4, Mansour *et al.*, Valancius and Smithies, and references in lines 36-45). In addition to the methods of piezo-electropipetting injection of sperm into mice ova to produce a zygote, Kimura *et al.* suggest that the described methods can be adapted and used to generate transgenic mice. Each reference provides the motivation to combine and use described methods

Art Unit: 1632

to generate a zygote/ animal in which the genome has been altered through homologous recombination.

Therefore, for the reasons above and of record, the rejection is maintained.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Zarling *et al.* US Patent 6,255,113, July 3, 2001. This patent has one inventor (Zarling) in common with the instant application, and is related to US Patent 5,763,240 used in the 103 rejections above.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 1632

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Woitach whose telephone number is (703)305-3732.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Karen M. Hauda, can be reached at (703)305-6608.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist Kay Pinkney whose telephone number is (703)306-3076.

Papers related to this application may be submitted by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CM1 Fax Center numbers are (703)308-4242 and (703)305-3014.

Joseph T. Woitach



DEBORAH CROUCH
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800/1630